

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed December 13, 2005. In order to advance prosecution of this Application, Claims 1-8, 14, and 20 have been amended. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this Application.

With regard to the use of the term 'operable to' in the claims, Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's interpretation thereof. The term 'operable to' merely describes the operation provided by the specific element being claimed. Even if the claimed schedule server may be interpreted as a personal computer capable of being operated to place an I/O wrapper around a render job, the Examiner has not cited any disclosure from the prior art that any personal computer has performed this function. Nevertheless, to advance prosecution of this Application, Applicant has removed the use of the term 'operable to' from the claims.

Claims 1-8 and 14-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Austin, et al. in view of Davis III, et al. Independent Claims 1 and 14 recite in general an ability to place an I/O wrapper around the render job and any files accompanying the render job to permit access to the files only upon processing of the render job. By contrast, neither the Austin, et al. nor Davis III, et al. patents have any disclosure with respect to placing an I/O wrapper around the render job as provided by the claimed invention. The Examiner indicates that the network service module of the Austin, et al. patent is a computer but cites no language from the Austin, et al. patent that its network service module can place an I/O wrapper around a render job and its accompanying files let alone any capability for those files to be accessed only upon processing of the render job as provided in the claimed invention. Therefore, Claims 1-8 and

14-20 are patentably distinct from the proposed Austin, et al.
- Davis III, et al. combination.

Applicant notes with appreciation the allowance of Claims
9-13.

This Response to Examiner's Final Action is necessary to
address the Examiner's interpretation of the claims and the
cited art. This Response to Examiner's Action could not have
been presented earlier as the Examiner has only now provided
the current interpretation of the claims and the cited art.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place this Application in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of all pending claims.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees required or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Attorneys for Applicants



Charles S. Fish

Reg. No. 35,870

February 13, 2006

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 600

Dallas, TX 75201-2980

(214) 953-6507

Customer Number: 05073